

**To:** Robert Daguillard (Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov]  
**From:** Daguillard, Robert  
**Sent:** Mon 8/10/2015 9:28:23 PM  
**Subject:** 8/10 call notes

Shaun: Ramping up response on the ground.

Unified area command center in Durango, w/unified commander

When will access to river be restored for drinking, recreational. We're coordinating this decision based on sampling and reading.

We don't anticipate any reopening until at least 8/17. Until notified otherwise, people should continue to abide by existing closures.

Ron Curry: We've enlarged our team. 2 Fed on-scene coordinators, 2 water quality experts and 10 technicians, 26 people total by the end of the day.

EPA Mobile command Center in Farmington as of last nights

We're collecting water quality samples from 9 locations.

Jared Blumenfeld: 12 people on the ground, mostly in Navajo Nation.

Taking over providing water from County at Montezuma Creek.

Superfund site? We've been up there for a number of years to address issues from acid pollution. Decision needs agreement from state and local authorities . Discussion ongoing.

How many affected by closure decisions: No total number?

(Joan Card): Pubile Water supply system affected; 2 systems in NM, 2 in Colorado, with intakes affected.

(Ron Curry) 5 systems affected in New Mexico.

How close to pre-event conditions can we get in light of sedimentation? What long-term commitment to this area?

Shaun: I don't want to speculate before we see what data tells us. Sediment on trajectory towards pre-event conditions. We're committed to this area.

Would it have been better protected if superfund?

Response Superfund allows for more expensive cleanup.

When will we get a better picture, especially as you mentioned the trajectory.

We're screening for 24 different metals.

What steps are being taken to address what went so wrong?

Independent investigation. We'll be taking steps to ensure this doesn't happen again.

What is the risk based on what data you have? Why is no action plan available?

We'll release those as they become available. (Joan) We're developing screening criteria so we can see what the risk is.

If no Plume is now three times initial assessment, how can we say there's no appreciable effect on fish and wildlife.

Deb was saying, in fact, there have been no impact reported.

Robert Daguiard

Office of Media Relations

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)

+1 (202) 360-0476 (cel)